

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/087,020

02/28/2002

Rainer Buesing

DE920010034US1/2326P

4028

7590

07/15/2004

SAWYER LAW GROUP

P.O. Box 51418

Palo Alto, CA 94303

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MERILYN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/087,020	Applicant(s) BUESING ET AL.	
	Examiner Merilyn P Nguyen	Art Unit 2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 8 and 12 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9-11 and 13-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02/28/2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>July 2, 2004</u> . | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>detailed action</u> . |

DETAILED ACTION

This application claims benefit of 01107130.5 filed on March 22, 2001.

1. Claims 1-20 are pending in this office action.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 6, 8, and 14 are objected to because of:

Claim 6, line 1, "claim 3" is suggested to change to --claim 5--.

Claim 8, line 2, "translates translating" is suggested to change to --translates--.

Claim 14, line 2, "classobtains" is suggested to change to --class obtains--. At line 3, "obtians" is suggested to change to --obtains--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-6, 9-11, and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1, 9, and 15, at line 3, line 2, line 3, respectively, there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the at least one child index" in the claim.

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claims 4 and 18, the preamble discloses a method for handling attributes in a document management system. However, the body of the claim does not describe how to handling these attributes. For example, the document index class and the folder index class are not connected or related to each other in order to handle attributes.

Regarding claim 6, at line 6, there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the document". This term has not introduced on the base claim.

Regarding claim 13, at line 3, there is insufficient antecedent basis for "defining means".

Regarding claim 16, there is insufficient antecedent basis for "program instruction for the virtual attribute". This claim misses functional operation.

Regarding claim 17, there is insufficient antecedent basis for "step (c)". There is no step (c) in claim 16.

Regarding claims 5, 13, and 19, there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the document class".

Regarding claim 20, there is insufficient antecedent basis for "step (c)". There is no step (c) in claim 19.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 4, 5, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sedlar (US 6,549,916).

Regarding claims 4 and 18, discloses a method and a computer readable medium containing program instructions for handling attributes in a document management system (See Fig. 16, Sedlar et al.) comprising the steps of: (a) defining a document index class having a plurality of attributes (See col. 37, line 10 to 20, Sedlar et al.); and (b) defining a folder index class having one attribute (Max_Children, Fig. 16, and col. 37, lines 21-30, Sedlar et al.).

Regarding claims 5 and 19, Sedlar discloses the step of (c) presenting the plurality of attributes of the document class based upon step (b) (See col. 39, lines 5-40, Sedlar et al.).

Allowable subject matter

5. Claims 6 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. Claims 1 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Claim 7 is allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

None of the references of record teaches or suggests the claimed (Claim 7) invention having, in addition to the other limitations in the claims, a document management system

Art Unit: 2171

interface including a dynamic document description for definition of virtual and/or extended attributes and a first search engine; and a content management system couple to the document management interface, wherein the content management system including a static document description and a second search engine.

None of the references of record teaches or suggests the claimed (Claims 1 and 15) invention having, in addition to the other limitations in the claims, the method of handling attributes in a document management system. Specifically, Claims 1 and 15 claim an invention with "real attributes" in the child index class as "virtual attributes" in the parent index class, such that these attributes in the parent index class do not exist physically, but only virtually. This is neither taught, nor suggested in the prior art.

The closest prior art of record, Bhargava et al. U.S Patent No. 5,752,017, also under the same assignee with the instant application, is directed to executing complex sql queries using projection operations that allow a choice in selection of virtual attributes from a source expression (Col. 2, lines 26-37). Bhargava discloses real attributes and virtual attributes which are used for mapping, wherein the real attributes available for manipulation to the user of the RDBMS and the virtual attributes used by the RDBMS for bookkeeping only. The real attributes are accessible to users and can be referenced externally in user queries. On the other hand, virtual attributes are not accessible to users and used to provide conceptional mapping (Col. 5, lines 22-40). However, Bhargava does not disclose child index class contains real attributes and parent index class contains the real attributes as virtual attributes.

Watkins U.S Patent No. 6,457,017 is directed to storing attribute of the managed files into databases. The stored attributes can include an ordered sequence between a plurality of

sibling files (See col. 1, lines 44-59). Watkins discloses an indexer for maintaining an index of all managed file (col. 1, lines 59-61). The folder class having attributes and there is relationship between parent and child folders (Figs. 10 and 11, and col. 10, lines 14-34). However, there are no parent index class contains the real attributes as virtual attributes.

Sedlar U.S Patent No. 6,549,916 is directed to managing files in a computer system, wherein file classes are organized into a class hierarchy (See Fig. 16). File classes having plurality of attributes wherein child class inherent all the attributes of its parent class. However, there are no parent index class contains the real attributes as virtual attributes.

Therefore, none of the references of record, alone or combined, teaches or suggests the claimed limitations as addressed above.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ranger U.S Patent No. 5,999,940 discloses interactive information discovery tool and methodology.

Smith U.S Patent No. 6,052,693 discloses system for assembling large databases through information extracted from text sources.

Flowers U.S Patent No. 5,802,524 discloses method and product for integrating an object-based search engine with a parametrically archived database.

Fong U.S Patent No. 6,704,747 discloses method and system for providing internet-based database interoperability using a frame model for universal database.

Art Unit: 2171

Davis U.S 2002/0073115 discloses RDL search engine.

Gautam Bhargava, Piyush Goel, and Bala Iyer discloses: "Hypergraph based reorderings of outer join queries with complex predicates", 1995.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marilyn P Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5177. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



MN
July 2, 2004



SAFET METJAHIC
PATENT EXAMINER
CENTER 2100